

Appl. No. 10/735,549
Amdt. dated June 29, 2006
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Advisory Action dated June 19, 2006, in which the Examiner did not enter amendments per Applicants' response to the final Office action dated April 5, 2006. In the final Office action, the Examiner: 1) objected to claims 1 and 14 because of informalities; 2) rejected claims 1-13 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lie (U.S. Pat. No. 6,671,868, hereinafter "Lie") in view of Dahl (U.S. Pat. No. 6,734,046, hereinafter "Dahl"); and 3) objected to claims 14-17 and 19-20, but indicated they would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the claim objection.

With this Response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 14 and canceled previously withdrawn claims 21-25. Applicants may choose to pursue the canceled claims in a continuation application. Based on the amendments and arguments contained herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

I. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objected to claims 1 and 14 for various informalities. Applicants disagree with the Examiner's request that the preamble of claim 14 must state the intended use or purpose of the invention (see final Office action, page 3) and note that the Examiner has not cited any authority to support the request. Simply to expedite allowance of the claims, Applicants have amended claim 14 to comply with the Examiner's request. The Examiner indicated claim 14 would be allowable if amended to overcome the Examiner's objection. For at least this reason, claim 14 and its dependent claims are allowable.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS

Amended claim 1, in part, requires "[a] bump map application [that] displays a plurality of editable textual character groups representative of a plurality of bumps, the textual character groups are arranged on the GUI according to a relative coordinate position of the bumps with respect to an origin." Claim 1 further requires "a track definition application executed by the CPU, the track definition application displaying on the GUI, individual track definitions and a macro that defines a plurality of tracks of an integrated circuit metal layer." Claim

Appl. No. 10/735,549
Amdt. dated June 29, 2006
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2006

1 further requires "[a] data extraction application automatically extracts data from the bump map application and the track definition application for use by a router application."

None of the references cited by the Examiner, considered individually or together, teach or suggest "a track definition application executed by the CPU, the track definition application displaying on the GUI, Individual track definitions and a macro that defines a plurality of tracks of an integrated circuit metal layer." For at least this reason, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 26, in part, requires "means for editing bump labels by displaying straight-line connections between bumps and input/output circuitry prior to displaying tracks between the bumps and input/output circuitry." None of the references cited by the Examiner, considered individually or together, teach or suggest this limitation. The Examiner does not even appear to address this limitation in the final Office action. For at least these reasons, claim 26 and its dependent claims are allowable.

III. CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including

Appl. No. 10/735,549
Amdt. dated June 29, 2006
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2006

fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan D. Christenson
PTO Reg. No. 54,036
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400